

The response filed 8-18-08 has been received.

As to the last two paragraphs of p. 16 of the REMARKS, consider the following:

Originally filed independent claim 14 is limited to a software product (i.e. article) for a Coriolis flowmeter as evidenced claim 14 expressly (i.e. "by said Coriolis flowmeter", lines 7-8, claim 14(original); and "calibration factor of said Coriolis flowmeter", line 2 from bottom of claim 14(original)) stating such. It is not a coincidence that the Office action of 2-5-08 employed a reference (i.e. Ruesch) against claim 14 that taught a software program to provide for correction of a Coriolis meter. In addition, originally filed independent claim 1 is a method claim, whose body limits the claim to include the step of defining a reference density "of *said* material flow" (italics added, lines 4-5 of claim 1(original). When one refers back in the claim to what the "said material flow" might be, one must refer to the preamble, which preamble states that the "material flow" (line 2 of claim 1(original)) is that of a "Coriolis flowmeter".

The originally filed claims are limited to the Coriolis flowmeter art. It was those claims that were examined. The amended claims 1 and 14 filed 5-2-08 unmistakably strikeout (specifically, delete) all references to Coriolis flowmeter by deleting that very phrase, and also further narrow those very claims, necessitating examination of a different field of endeavor (calibration of

Art Unit: 2856

densimeters). The original claims are directed to the combination (ABbr; the "A" representative of the "Coriolis flowmeter" limitation), and the amended claims are directed to a patentably distinct subcombination (Bsp). Applicant is permitted an examination and re-examination; not an examination (of one invention) and examination (of a different invention).

The period for response continues to run from the mailing of the Non-compliant mailed 7-18-08.

/Robert R. Raevis/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2856